



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------|
| 10/743,088 | 12/23/2003 | Hiroaki Sakaguchi | 24704US6 | 8105 |
| 22850 | 7590 | 03/17/2008 | | |
| OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314 | | | EXAMINER TURCHEN, JAMES R | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2139 | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 03/17/2008 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/743,088

Applicant(s)

SAKAGUCHI, HIROAKI

Examiner

JAMES TURCHEN

Art Unit

2139

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 6, 7, 11-15 and 18-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 6, 7, 11-15 and 18-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/888)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 11-15, and 18-20 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4, 6 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belu (2002/0033762) in view of Videcrantz et al (US 6,275,588, herein Videcrantz).

Regarding claim 1:

Belu discloses an information processing apparatus comprising compression means for combining and compressing a plurality of individual programs (".exe" and ".dll" files) that are placed next to each other because they are determined to have the same "binary program" file type (paragraph 51, paragraphs 61-68). A binary file is defined by Encarta as a "computer file in computer-readable format: a computer file that contains data in a raw or nontext state made up of characters that only a computer can read. Executable programs are stored and transmitted in binary files, as are most numerical data files." Machine language is defined by Encarta as "computer instructions: instructions, usually written in binary code, telling a computer how to process data." Belu additionally discloses having a file header that contains auxiliary data such as the names, sizes, compressed sizes, etc. (paragraphs 40-42). Belu does not disclose the total amount of files in the compressed file. Winzip

is similar to Belu in that Winzip provides a method and system for archiving multiple files. Item 2 of figure 1 of Winzip discloses the total amount of files within the compressed file. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Belu in order to provide how many files are in the archive. Belu also does not disclose encrypting the compressed file. Videcrantz discloses having a compression means and encryption means for encrypting the compressed file (column 20 lines 45-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the compression and encryption system of Videcrantz with the compression system of Belu in order to secure the compressed file. Belu, Winzip, and Videcrantz inherently discloses the compression means and generation means. In paragraph 22, Belu discloses that the invention relates to compression of multiple files into a single file called an archive and then goes on to talk about data characteristics. It is inherent in the reference of Belu, that this is implemented on a computer system (it's well known in the art that a computer inherently contains at least a processor, memory, and hard drive). Furthermore, Belu grouping files by their extension (paragraphs 51, 61-63, such as .exe, .dll, .doc, etc), which inherently discloses that there is an operating system running on a computer system. Belu discloses compression, and generating and outputting, therefore, the means for compression, generation and output are inherently within the reference.

Regarding claim 4:

Belu and Videcrantz disclose the information processing apparatus according to claim 1, further comprising generation means for generating second auxiliary data

indicating a size of said compressed program data (Belu, paragraphs 40-42, program 42, name, location and size of the files are included in the header). It is inherent that the compressed files and auxiliary data are stored either in RAM, a hard drive, or cache.

Regarding claims 6 and 19:

Claims 6 and 19 teach the method of the apparatus claims 1 and 4 and are hereby rejected under the same reasoning as claims 1 and 4.

Claims 7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belu (US 2002/0143792), Videcrantz, and Winzip.

Regarding claim 7:

Belu discloses an information processing apparatus, comprising:
decompression means receiving compressed program data and for decompressing said compressed program data to output decompressed and combined individual programs (paragraph 88, the decompression engine decompresses the compressed input file data portion);

Belu discloses first auxiliary data indicating a total number of the individual programs that were combined and compressed and a size of each of the combined and compressed individual programs (paragraph 66, the file size, name, etc.), but does not disclose:

decryption means for decrypting encrypted data including a plurality of encrypted combined and compressed individual programs that each include a same instruction set and encrypted to output decrypted compressed program data and decrypted auxiliary

Art Unit: 2139

data indicating the total number of combined and compressed individual programs and the size of each of the combined and compressed individual programs.

Videcrantz discloses decrypting data and passing it to the data decompressor (column 25 lines 46-67). It would have been obvious to alter the system disclosed by Belu with the system of encrypting/decrypting disclosed by Videcrantz in order to allow for the securing of the compressed information. Videcrantz and Belu still do not disclose:

creation means operatively connected to the decryption means for receiving the decrypted first auxiliary data and for creating a management table about locations of individual ones of said plurality of individual programs based on said decrypted first auxiliary data; and

memory means operatively connected to receive the decompressed and combined individual programs from the decompression means and to receive the management table from the creation means and for storing the decompressed and combined individual programs and said management table.

Winzip discloses a management table (figure 1) of all of the compressed files. It is inherent that each file maps to a specific location within the compressed file. It would have been obvious to combine the system of Winzip with the system disclosed by Belu and Videcrantz in order to provide a user interface for selecting individual files. It is inherent in the references of Belu, Videcrantz, and Winzip that the decryption, decompression, and creation are done on a computer system which contains a processor, hard drive, and RAM.

Regarding claim 11:

Claim 11 teaches the method of the apparatus claim 7 and is hereby rejected under the same reasoning as claim 7.

Claims 13-15, 18, and 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belu ('762) in view of Videcrantz, Winzip, and Belu ('792).

Regarding claims 12, 13 and 15:

Claims 12 and 13 are the combination of claims 1 and 7 with the exception of the claimed portion "execution means for receiving and executing said predetermined one of the plurality of combined individual programs." Therefore, Belu, Videcrantz, and Winzip disclose the apparatus of claims 12 and 13, and claims 12 and 13 are rejected under the same reasoning as claims 1 and 7. Belu, Videcrantz, and Winzip discloses execution means for receiving and executing said predetermined one of the plurality of combined individual programs (Belu '792, paragraph 99, the file is decompressed and launched with the appropriate software).

Regarding claim 14:

Belu, Videcrantz, and Winzip disclose the information processing apparatus according to claim 13, wherein said execution means executes processing of said predetermined one of the plurality of combined individual programs based on said management table stored in said memory means. Belu '792 discloses multiple files are able to be added to the compressed file (paragraph 71) and Winzip discloses a management table (figure 1, a table providing the file names in a user interface). The

combination of Belu with Winzip would allow a user to select the file to decompress and Belu would decompress and execute the file as mentioned in the rejection of claim 13.

Regarding claims 18 and 20:

Claims 18 and 20 are the method of apparatus claims 12 and 13 and are hereby rejected under the same reasoning as claims 12 and 13.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMES TURCHEN whose telephone number is (571)270-1378. The examiner can normally be reached on MTWRF 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571)272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christian LaForgia/

Art Unit: 2139

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2139

JRT